



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,672	05/31/2000	Bruce Hodge	56129050-3	2979

26453 7590 10/31/2003

BAKER & MCKENZIE  
805 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,672

Applicant(s)

HODGE, BRUCE

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 27, 2003 has been entered in view of Applicant's Request for Continued Examination filed September 19, 2003. Claims 1-18 and 20-22 are pending.

### ***Oath/Declaration***

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56.

Applicant has only acknowledged the duty to disclose information under 37 CFR 1.56(a). The duty to disclose information under 37 CFR 1.56, in its entirety (including 37 CFR 1.56(a-e)), must be acknowledged.

***Response to Amendment***

3. Applicant's amendment to the specification appropriately addresses the objection to the objection to the specification, based on the use of statements disparaging the prior art, as detailed in the previous office action. Accordingly, this objection is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

4. Applicant's amendment to the claims appropriately addresses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, of claims 20 and 21, as detailed in the previous office action. Accordingly, this rejection is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 27, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. In response to Applicant's arguments on page 8, in paragraph 4 (of the response filed June 27, 2003), the Examiner asserts that the phrase "concatenated to" implies only that the recited elements are linked or chained together -- no order is implied. Since claims 12 and 14 each specify the same elements being concatenated, namely the joint attribute, type declaration, and object identifier, the Examiner maintains that in the absence of a specified order in which the elements are concatenated, claims 12 and 14 are indistinguishable from each other. Accordingly,

Art Unit: 2122

the warning of possible objection to the claims, as detailed in the previous office action, is maintained and reproduced below.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-21, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a), have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Specification*

8. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (see, for example, p. 25, line 19). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

### *Claim Objections*

9. Applicant is advised that should claim 12 be found allowable, claim 14 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Art Unit: 2122

10. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: “perform method” in line 2 should read --perform a method--. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claims 1-15, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites “the determining done without requiring additional referencing each time the object identifier having the type declaration is read” in lines 10-11. Applicant’s original specification fails to disclose any information as specifically not needed during subsequent reading of an object identifier.

Claims 2-15, 20, and 21 are rejected based on the inherited base claim limitation recited in claim 1 and rejected as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2122

13. Claims 1-15, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites “the determining done without requiring additional referencing each time the object identifier having the type declaration is read” in lines 10-11. When a variable is used again after its initial declaration in a program, conventional programming techniques require that some means of reference be provided to determine that the same variable is being used as before, either during compilation or during execution by an interpreter. For example, when an integer variable to be used as a simple counter is declared, a specific location in memory (or a pointer to that location) is allocated to store the value of that variable. When an instruction is processed that increments the counter variable, a reference must be read to determine that the variable has already been declared and a specific address (or a pointer to that address) storing the data associated with the variable must be determined to store the updated result. Applicant’s specification fails to provide an alternative means of synchronizing data updates for a variable that does not require any additional referencing when the variable instance is read, nor would such knowledge be generally available or well known. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to practice the invention as claimed.

Claims 2-15, 20, and 21 are rejected based on the inherited base claim limitation recited in claim 1 and rejected as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2122

14. In the rejections based on Prior Art contained in this office action, the aforementioned claim limitations upon which the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, are based, are ignored for the purpose of further examination.

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16. Claims 1-18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 16, and 17 recited the phrase “[used/carried] throughout a life of a program” in lines 12-13, 8, and 5, respectively. Applicant has not provided sufficient context or a definition of what the “life” of a program is intended to encompass (for example, run-time, lines of code, time of mere existence or usefulness, etc.). Therefore, the scope of the claim is not ascertainable.

In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets “[used/carried] throughout the life of a program as a syntax for referencing a an object” as *the object identifier with the embedded type declaration providing a valid syntax for referencing an object throughout subsequent occurrences in the source code of the referenced object*, for the purpose of further examination on the merits of the claims.

Claims 1-15, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected based on the inherited base claim limitation recited in claims 1 and 16 and rejected as set forth above.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

18. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “DynaPage Brief Synopsis”, February 1998 (hereinafter *DPBS*) and “DynaScript Code Example,” February 1998 (hereinafter *DSCE*) in view of the Official Notice taken below.

a) “DynaPage Brief Synopsis” describes the DynaPage dynamic page interpreter product and is hyperlinked to “DynaScript Code Example,” which is apparently intended to provide an example of a page created with the programming language provided by the DynaPage product (see *DPBS*, second sentence). As these documents are disclosed as describing/illustrating features of the same product, the motivation to combine the teachings of the two documents is readily apparent, i.e., the inventor of the product has already combined the features disclosed by both documents, as such is disclosed in the documents themselves.

b) As per claim 1, *DPBS* and *DSCE* disclose allowing a type declaration in a programming language to be embedded within an object identifier (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 7, disclosing a “URL@CustNumber” object identifier); and allowing the type declaration to be delimited from the object identifier using a joint attribute (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 7, disclosing a

“URL@CustNumber” object identifier having an “@” character joint attribute), **the joint attribute used by an interpreter or a compiler of the programming language to separate the type declaration from the object identifier to determine an object type of an object being declared in the object identifier when the object identifier having the type declaration is read** (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 6, disclosing “URL@” as a variable type); **and allowing the object identifier with the embedded type declaration to be used throughout a life of a program as a syntax for referencing an object in the program** (*the object identifier with the embedded type declaration providing a valid syntax for referencing an object throughout subsequent occurrences in the source code of the referenced object*; see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 30-39, disclosing the repeated use of the “STR@Cmd” variable using the same syntax each time).

*DPBS* and *DSCE* fail to expressly disclose the use of program storage device readable by a machine. However, Official Notice is taken that the use of such program storage devices has been well known and practiced in software deployment and execution. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to include the use of a program storage device tangibly embodying the product and code disclosed by *DPBS* and *DSCE*. One would be motivated to do to employ established means of making such program instructions available to a computer system for execution.

c) As per claim 2, the program instructions disclosed by *DSCE* are inherently parsed and translated by the DynaPage dynamic page interpreter disclosed in *DPBS*. Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

d) As per claims 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose the type declaration including a SQL database object type (see, for example, *DSCE*, line 9); a cursor database object type (see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 41-42); a universal resource locator object type (see, for example, *DSCE*, line 7); and a hypertext markup language object type (see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 12 and 15). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such claims also would have been obvious.

e) As per claim 8, although *DSCE* fails to expressly disclose an environment object type, *DPBS* further discloses accessing environment variables. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to include an environment object type to represent such environment variables. One would be motivated to do so to support such a variable type in a manner consistent with the syntax of other variable references.

f) As per claims 11-14, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose the joint attribute being concatenated to the type declaration and the object identifier being concatenated to the joint attribute (see, for example, *DSCE*, line 7). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such claims also would have been obvious.

g) As per claim 15, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose the object identifier including dynamically evaluated expressions (see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 29-30). Therefore for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

h) As per claim 20, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose the type declaration allowing a compiler or interpreter of the programming language to operate on an object declared in the type declaration without an explicit call to construct the object (see, for example, *DSCE*, line 30, showing the initial use of the “STR@Cmd” variable without any prior explicit call to create the variable; see also *DPBS*, describing the use of the DynaPage interpreter). Therefore for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

i) As per claim 21, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose the type declaration allowing a compiler or interpreter of the programming language to automatically instantiate an object being declared in the type declaration when the type declaration embedded with the object identifier is first read by the programming language compiler or interpreter (see, for example, *DSCE*, line 30, showing the initial use of the “STR@Cmd” variable without any prior explicit call to create the variable; see also *DPBS*, describing the use of the DynaPage interpreter). Therefore for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

j) As per claim 16, *DPBS* and *DSCE* disclose embedding an object type indicator with an object identifier name, **the object type indicator and the object identifier name delimited by a predefine symbol** (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 7, disclosing a “URL@CustNumber” object identifier having an “@” character joint attribute), wherein a machine **uses the predefined symbol to separate the object type indicator and the object identifier name to identify an object type for the object identifier name and the object identifier name having the object**

**type indicator is used throughout a life of a program as a syntax for referencing an object in the program** (*the object identifier with the embedded type declaration providing a valid syntax for referencing an object throughout subsequent occurrences in the source code of the referenced object*; see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 30-39, disclosing the repeated use of the “STR@Cmd” variable using the same syntax each time). Therefore, for reasons stated above (see item 18a), such a claim also would have been obvious.

k) As per claim 18, *DPBS* and *DSCE* further disclose joining the object type indicator with the object identifier name with a joint symbol (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 7, disclosing a “URL@CustNumber” object identifier having an “@” character joint attribute). Therefore, for reasons stated above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

l) As per claim 17, *DPBS* and *DSCE* disclose prepending an object type followed by a predefined symbol to an object identifier string, the object type, the predefined symbol, and the object identifier string forming a symbol name to be carried throughout a life of a program as a syntax for referencing an object in the program (*the object identifier with the embedded type declaration providing a valid syntax for referencing an object throughout subsequent occurrences in the source code of the referenced object*; see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 30-39, disclosing the repeated use of the “STR@Cmd” variable using the same syntax each time), wherein a machine interpreting the symbol name in the program uses the predefined symbol to delineate the object type from the object to determine the object type (see, for example, *DSCE*,

Art Unit: 2122

line, 6, disclosing “URL@” as a variable type). Therefore, for reasons stated above (see item 18a), such a claim also would have been obvious.

m) As per claim 22, *DPBS* and *DSCE* disclose integrating an explicit object type definition within a string of characters that define an object symbol name that is used throughout a program for referencing an object (*the object identifier with the embedded type declaration providing a valid syntax for referencing an object throughout subsequent occurrences in the source code of the referenced object*; see, for example, *DSCE*, lines 30-39, disclosing the repeated use of the “STR@Cmd” variable using the same syntax each time), the object type definition delineated by an additional predefined symbol in the string of characters, the additional predefined symbol being an explicit symbol separate from the explicit object type definition (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 7, disclosing a “URL@CustNumber” object identifier having an “@” character joint attribute), wherein a machine interpreting the object symbol name throughout the program determines what type the object symbol name is by recognizing the additional predefined symbol in the string of characters and reading the explicit object type definition in the string of characters (see, for example, *DSCE*, line, 6, disclosing “URL@” as a variable type).

*DPBS* and *DSCE* fail to expressly disclose the use of program storage device readable by a machine. However, Official Notice is taken that the use of such program storage devices has been well known and practiced in software deployment and execution. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to include the use of a program storage device tangibly embodying the product and code

Art Unit: 2122

disclosed by *DPBS* and *DSCE*. One would be motivated to do to employ established means of making such program instructions available to a computer system for execution.

19. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DPBS* and *DSCE* in view of Official Notice, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Breck Carter, "Tip 85: Java in the Database (5) Cross-Server Database I/O," December 1998 (hereinafter *Carter*).

As per claim 5, *DPBS* and *DSCE* fail to expressly disclose a connection database object type. However, *Carter* teaches a connection database object type (ASAClass class; see, for example, pages 2-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to include a connection database object type into the product and code of *DPBS* and *DSCE* as per the teachings of *Carter*. One would be motivated to do so to provide a means for establishing and referencing database connections through a simplified interface in a manner consistent with the syntax of other variable references.

20. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DPBS* and *DSCE* in view of Official Notice, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Samuel R. Blackburn, "WFC - CextensibleMarkupLanguageElement," September 1998, (hereinafter *Blackburn*).

As per claim 10, *DPBS* and *DSCE* fail to expressly disclose an extensible markup language object type. However, *Blackburn* teaches an extensible markup language object type (CExtensibleMarkupLanguageElement class; see, for example, page 1, paragraph 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the

Art Unit: 2122

invention was made to include an extensible markup language markup object type into the product and code of *DPBS* and *DSCE* as per the teachings of *Blackburn*. One would be motivated to do so to provide a means for parsing and outputting the elements that make up an XML document through a simplified interface in a manner consistent with the syntax of other variable references.

### ***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The



Art Unit: 2122

Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

EBK

October 28, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Hoangvn Antony Nguyen Ba". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**ANTONY NGUYEN-BA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**